UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,560	06/12/2006	Rainer Aufischer	AUFISCHER ET AL-1 PCT	1583
25889 COLLARD & I	7590 03/26/201 ¹ ROE, P.C.		EXAMINER	
1077 NORTHE	RN BOULEVARD		PILKINGTON, JAMES	
ROSLYN, NY	113/0		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3656	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/26/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/582,560	AUFISCHER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JAMES PILKINGTON	3656	

	JAMES PILKINGTON	3656	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>15 March 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Anno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE r).	g date of the final rejectio E FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origithan three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENIAN. 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, by (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti	nsideration and/or search (see NO` w);	ΓE below);	
appeal; and/or	to form for appear by materially for	adomy or omipmying tr	10 100000 101
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		•	-
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ll be entered and an ex	cplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		- 4: - 5	
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. So	al and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a).
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attache	∍d.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	·	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Thomas R. Hannon/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3656	/JAMES PILKINGTON, Examiner, Art Unit 3656		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Nortio does not disclose the method of calculating the initial thickness of the cover layer so that the cover layer will wear away at a time not later than the time at which the slide layer experiences metal breaking.

First, Norito discloses all of the recited structure of the claim including the support shell, sliding layer and cover layer. Norito further discloses that the thickness of the cover layer is selected based on approximated wear amounts. Second, the recitation "wherein the average service life of the slide layer is used to calculate the initial thickness of the cover layer so that the cover layer will wear away at a time not later than the time at which the slide layer experiences metal breakage" does not address any particular structure. The recitation merely recites a design step that does not limit the claim to any particular structure or thickness of the layers. Although Norito does not disclose how the thickness of the layers are determined the required structure of the claim is disclosed and may indeed have a cover layer which has an initial thickness that will wear away at a time not later than the time at which the slide layer experiences metal breakage. Furthermore, designing a component to wear out at a point that is not prior to breaking is indeed obvious to one skilled in the art since such an arrangement would provide optimum run time and service life for the lost cost factor.

Applicant argues that Norito does not disclose a feature that permits recognition/indication of the wear and tear on the running layer although a visible difference between the surfaces could be present.

First, the independent claim does not address any particular structure or require a recognition feature corresponding to the reducition of fatigue strength which indications the end of the run time of the bearing. But Norito discloses two different materials which are visually different and the use of two different materials permits recognition of when the changing of the bearing is necessary (i.e. the cover layer is worn the under layer becomes visible) therefore Norito meets this feactuere.